



## Access over ownership: the case of meeting facilities in Lyngby

Nielsen, Susanne Balslev; Brinkø, Rikke

*Published in:*

Proceeding of the 1st Conference of interdisciplinary research on real estate

*Publication date:*

2016

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*

Nielsen, S. B., & Brinkø, R. (2016). Access over ownership: the case of meeting facilities in Lyngby. In *Proceeding of the 1st Conference of interdisciplinary research on real estate* (pp. 148-151)

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## 17. Access over ownership: the case of meeting facilities in Lyngby Knowledge City

Susanne Balslev Nielsen

Technical University of Denmark/Oslo and Akershus University Collage of Applied Science, Norway  
E-mail: sbni@dtu.dk

Rikke Brinkø

Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

Collaborative Consumption, access economy or the sharing economy are all terms describing the new fast growing business built on the sharing of resources and promoting access over ownership. It is a paradigm shift that has made it to the Times magazine list of the “10 ideas that will change the world”. Within this overall paradigm, shared space, is also gaining grounds. The purpose of the study is to investigate the attitude towards shared space in an urban context with a particular focus on meeting facilities. To what degree is there an interest in sharing meeting facilities within a city or a municipality? The Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge is used as case, as this strategic collaboration on municipal level includes a vision of sharing facilities to stimulate regional development. The attitude towards shared space in the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge is studied in a three-step qualitative research process. The first survey investigates the City of Knowledge’s members attitude towards shared space in general with questions like, what are you most likely to share with others? And what would you like to gain access to? A workshop further explored motivations and practical needs. The second survey investigates in particular the attitude towards shared meeting facilities. The Brinkø Typology of Shared Use of Space and Facilities is used as the theoretical frame of the study (Brinkø et al 2015). This study show that the members of the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge collaboration are very positive towards the concept of shared space, but more reluctant about sharing own facilities. A majority of the informants are often using externally owned facilities for meetings and events, and they prefer professional meeting facilities to schools, universities and sports facilities. This point to the need for buildings owners/operators to develop relevant service concepts, if a shared space strategy, should increase the use rate of existing buildings. The study show that in the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge there is a positive attitude towards shared space as concept and as local strategy for gaining access to e.g. meeting facilities. The survey also demonstrates the member’s experience of barriers, which suggest that there are practical barriers to overcome before access is more important than ownership, not only in theory, but also in practice.

**Keywords:** Facilities Management, property management, space management, shared space, sharing economy

### 1 Introduction

*Collaborative Consumption*, *access economy* or the *sharing economy* are all terms describing the new fast growing business built on the sharing of resources and promoting access over ownership. It is a paradigm shift that has made it to the Times magazine list of the “10 ideas that will change the world” (Walsh 2011). Within this overall paradigm, *shared space*, is also gaining grounds in real estate management and FM, as a way for individuals and organisations to gain access to facilities without owning them and without long term leasing contracts (e.g. Meel and Brinkø 2014; Brinkø et al 2015; Brinkø and Nielsen 2015; Kojo and Nenonen 2016; Rytönen 2016).

Shared space is a concept that can lead to positive effects for multiple stakeholders. A user will be able to use a facility without owning the building or engaging in leasing contracts, but gain access to use a facility free of charge or for a fee for the access and use. From the perspective of a facilities manager, who has the task of ensuring a satisfactory use rate of a certain building or space, the shared

space movement is a positive development which can help intensify the use of buildings that are perceived as underutilised. From a societal development perspective there is a deliberate agenda of creating lively and attractive urban environments which can stimulate cultural and economic innovation, and the increase of people using the facilities and the mix of user groups is a strategy for many innovation hubs.

From a sustainability perspective shared space holds a potential for a positive environmental effect. Especially if less new buildings are built because of shared space, then a significant environmental effect is avoided as building materials consumes resources, are energy demanding to produce and the building represents a potential waste problem once exceeding its operational phase (Cabeza et al 2014 and Nielsen et al 2016). Considering already existing buildings, the potential positive or negative effect of shared space, in relative and absolute terms, is more unclear. From a single-building perspective the environmental impact is likely to be greater due to intensified use, but this intensified use of one building should in theory be caused by less intensified use of several others, which then can be made available for other uses; leading to the possibility of fewer new buildings constructed. The effect will of course also be influenced by the condition of the buildings, meaning that if more use is moved from buildings with a poor environmental performance to buildings with a better one, this can push the effects in a positive direction, whereas the opposite is true if the use is moved from well-performing buildings to buildings with a lower environmental performance etc.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the attitude towards shared space in an urban context with a particular focus on meeting facilities. To what degree is there an interest in sharing otherwise private meeting facilities within a city or a municipality? The *Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge* in Greater Copenhagen, Denmark, is used as case, as this strategic collaboration on municipal level includes a vision of sharing facilities. The *Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge* being a private association and unique partnership between private companies, research and educational institutions, local authority, housing associations and citizens to ensure the city of Lyngby's continued growth through collaboration across traditional boundaries. Information about the *Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge* is available at [www.vidensby.dk](http://www.vidensby.dk).

The Brinkø Typology of Shared Use of Space and Facilities is used as the theoretical background of this study (Brinkø et al 2015), and can be seen in Figure 1. It provides an overview of 4 types of shared space and a vocabulary for categorizing a case of shared space. Each type is characterised by *what* is shared, *when* (simultaneously or serial), *why*, by *who* and *how* is the sharing managed. 3 of the 4 types are relevant with a focus on meeting facilities for events that are larger than a person or organisation can host at own premises. The type of sharing at the smallest scale, where you share specific facilities such as a desk or workspaces, are perceived not relevant in the case of this study.

The three relevant types of shared space are:

- *Sharing several facilities in an open or semi-closed community*
  - Example: The facilities are a meeting room with reception, toilets, catering services etc. The space is open for the public to book and use, or if it is semi-closed, only to be used by certain members of certain organisations.
- *Sharing physical space in a building or a building in itself in a closed community*
  - Example: Two companies in the same building is sharing e.g. entrance, reception, cantina, and meeting rooms.
- *Sharing facilities between users in a network of buildings/organizations in an open, semi-closed or closed community*
  - Example: A network of companies in a city decided to open their meeting facilities for external users. If it is in an open community, anybody can book the facilities. In a semi-closed it is only eg. members from the network or if it is in a closed community, it is only specific organisations and you cannot obtain the right to access e.g. by becoming a member of the network.




Figure 1: The Typology of shared use of facilities (Brinkø, Nielsen, & Meel, 2015)

Accommodation of space as well as monitoring and optimising use/vacancy is a classical task within Facilities Management as a management discipline (Alexander 1992 and CEN/TC348 2006). In contrast to researchers like (Kovacs 2012) and (May 2015) who perceives low use rates as an optimisation challenge which can be described and solved by mathematical means, we focus on the socio-technical conditions for changing the situation. In a change management perspective it is important to know the stakeholders needs and motivations, why stakeholders perceptions of needs, motivations, opportunities and needs are the focus of this paper.

In the following we centre the focus on sharing facilities, and in particular meeting and conference facilities, between member organisations of the strategic urban network collaboration the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge. The purpose is to assess the potential for sharing space in the City of Knowledge by studying What is the members' motivation? What are eventual barriers? And how to organize the sharing?

## 2-4 Methodology and research

This article is selected for being published in the international journal Emerald Facilities.

## 5 Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitude towards shared space in an urban context with a particular focus on meeting facilities. The background was to intensify the use of buildings and in particular special facilities for larger meetings and conferences, as all buildings which are heated, cooled and maintained but remain largely underused over time are not environmentally or economically efficient and because giving others access to underutilised space can stimulate synergies, innovation and attractiveness of buildings and cities.

We found a positive attitude towards the concept of shared space. However, the survey particular on sharing of conference facilities showed a less positive attitude which leads us to conclude that the general attitude is positive towards sharing, but asked specifically about motivations and willingness to share, there is a less positive attitude.

This study show that the members of the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge collaboration are very positive towards the concept of shared space, but more reluctant about sharing own facilities. A majority of the informants are often using externally owned facilities for meetings and events, and they prefer professional meeting facilities to schools, universities and sports facilities. This point to the need for buildings owners/operators to develop relevant service concepts, if a shared space strategy, should increase the use rate of existing buildings.

## Acknowledgements

This paper could not be written without the professional collaboration with the Lyngby-Taarbæk City of Knowledge Secretariat and in particular CEO Caroline Arends and project coordinator Maya Yhman and the City of Knowledge members who organized the second survey and provided the setup for the workshop.

## References:

- Alexander, K (1992) "Facilities Management Practice", *Facilities*, Vol.10 Iss 5 pp. 11-18
- Brinkø, R & Nielsen, SB (2015) "Shared space in a municipal sports facility: The case of Lyngby Idraetsby". In K Alexander & I Price (eds), *Research Papers. Advancing Knowledge in Facilities Management: People make Facilities Management*. EuroFM. EuroFM Research Papers.
- Brinkø, R., Nielsen, S.B., Meel, J.v. (2015) "Access over ownership – a typology of shared space", *Facilities*, Vol. 33 Iss: 11/12, pp.736 – 751.
- Cabeza, L.F., Rincón, L., Vilariño, V. Pérez, G. and Castell, A. (2014) "Life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle energy analysis (LCEA) of buildings and the building sector: A review". *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. Elsevier.
- CEN/TC348 (2006) "Facilities Management – Terms and definitions, EN 15221-1".
- Kovacs, A (2012) "MoreSpace – Strategies for an Intensive Use of Built Environment over Time". Proceedings of the 11<sup>th</sup> EuroFM research symposium, 24-25. May 2012 in Copenhagen, Denmark. Polyteknisk Forlag.
- Kojo, I. and Nenonen, S. (2016) "Typologies for co-working spaces in Finland – what and how?". *Facilities*, Vol. 34 Iss: 5/6, pp.302 – 313.
- May, M. (2015) "Economic Space Utilization and Sustainability by IT-based Optimization", *International Journal of Facilities Management*. Vol 6 No 1.
- Meel, JV & Brinkø, R (2014) "Working apart together". *EuroFM Insight*, no. September, pp. 10-11.
- Nielsen, S.B., Junghans, A. and Jones, K. (2016) "Chapter 15 Sustainability". In: *Facilities Management and Corporate Real Estate Management as Value Drivers: How to Manage and Measure Adding Value*, by P.A. Jensen and T.v.d. Voordt. Routledge. (forthcoming)
- Rytönen, E. (2016) "*University campus management dynamics in spatial transformation: Systemic facilitation of interdisciplinary learning communities*". Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Civil and Structural Engineering. Aalto University. Finland.
- Brinkø, R., Nielsen, S. B., & Meel, J. Van. (2015). Access over ownership - a typology of shared space. *Facilities*.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Walsh, B. (2011) "10 Ideas That Will Change the World". *Time*. Retrieved from [http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2059521\\_2059717\\_2059710,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2059521_2059717_2059710,00.html)